



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/065,992	12/08/2002	Haruyo Fukui	39.005-AG	6667
29453	7590	09/07/2006	EXAMINER	
JUDGE & MURAKAMI IP ASSOCIATES DOJIMIA BUILDING, 7TH FLOOR 6-8 NISHITEMMA 2-CHOME, KITA-KU OSAKA-SHI, 530-0047 JAPAN			TURNER, ARCHENE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1775	
DATE MAILED: 09/07/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Art Unit: 1775

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 5,6, 8, 13,14,16,19,20,22,23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Harovirta ("Hardmetal woodcutting....amorphous carbon").

Harovirta discloses the claimed carbon coating with the claimed thickness and compressive stress on the claimed substrate having the claimed grain size .

3. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 1775

4. Claims 5,6, 8, 13,14,1619,20,22,23 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory double patenting over claims 1,7,9 of U. S. Patent No. 6,881,475 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: the stress value is an inherent in the disclosed coating of the patent.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2,4,21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al (6,565,957) in view of Moriguchi et al (5,776,588).

Nakamura et al discloses the claimed coating having the claimed components and thickness (column 3, line 60-62 and claim 8) but does not explicitly disclose the claimed roughness.

Art Unit: 1775

Moriguchi et al discloses that the stress on an inner layer may be reduced by removing the outer alumina layer and discloses the claimed stress and roughness. Note the limitation of the roughness being as deposited is a process limitation which does not impact the final product. How the roughness is produced is not of consequence here.

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to remove the alumina layer in Nakamura et al as suggested by Moriguchi et al to reveal the disclosed invention, as this technique is known in the art to improve the performance of cutting tools.

7. Claims 10,12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al (6,565,957) in view of Moriguchi et al (5,776,588), in further view of Oskarsson (6,228,139).

Nakamura et al in view of Moriguchi et al discloses the invention substantially as claimed except for the claimed specific of the substrate, although both Nakamura et al or Moriguchi discloses the known used of providing their coating on WC-CO substrates.

Oskarsson discloses the claimed WC grain size for a cement carbide with the claimed cobalt content.

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the cemented carbide of Nakamura et al in view of Moriguchi et al with the claimed

grain size, as this grain size is known to improve the performance of cemented carbides, as shown by Oskarsson.

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2,4-6,8,10,12-14,16-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Archene Turner whose new telephone number is (571) 272-1545. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday, Wednesday through Friday from 10:30 am. to 6:00 pm.

Art Unit: 1775

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jennifer McNeil can be reached on (571) 272-1540. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306. Please remember to include on the fax, the art unit 1775, serial number and Examiner's name.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


A. A. Turner
Primary Examiner
Group 1700

aat